

4 determination of if said audio message contains a facsimile  
5 message or a voice message; and,  
6 digitization of said ~~audio message~~ if said audio message  
7 contains said voice message and receipt of said facsimile message  
8 if said audio message contains said facsimile message.--

1 --18. (New) The article of claim 13, further comprising allocating a  
2 ~~message processing resource~~--

**REMARKS**

Applicants have added claims 2-18 without the addition of new matter. No claims have been cancelled.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Richardson, Jr. et al. (Patent No. 5,113,430) hereinafter referred to as Richardson.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of the amendments and addition made to the claim and of the following discussion.

It is axiomatic that for a reference to be anticipatory, each and every feature in the claims must be disclosed by the single reference. Richardson **does not** anticipate the features present in the currently amended claims to allow distribution of voicemail messages via the use of electronic mail messages, which involves the "conversion of [an] incoming audio message into a digital representation of said audio message; and sending said

digital representation of said audio message to [an] electronic mail address in an electronic mail message." (Amended Claim 1, lines 10-15). In addition, Richardson also does not anticipate the association of a recipient's phone number to an e-mail address to allow an incoming voice call to be delivered to the recipient by "determining a user account and an electronic mail address ... associated with [an] inbound address." (Amended Claim 1, lines 6-7). Applicants submit that Richardson also does not suggest the above features.

In view of the foregoing discussion and the amendments made to the claims, Applicants submit that the § 102(b) rejections are overcome. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the § 102(b) rejections be withdrawn.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 6/2/99

By: G.G.T. J  
George G. C. Tseng  
Reg. No. 41,355

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California  
90025  
(310) 207-3800

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C.  
20231 on 6/2/99.

Barbara E. Wilson 6/2/99  
Barbara E. Wilson Date